

# Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

## MEETING PURPOSE AND GOALS:

- Summarize Public Comments & Outline DWR Responses
- Ideas for Next Public Process
- Update on CALFED Urban WUE Study
- Improving Quantitative Information

## CONTENTS

---

Special Caucus Presentations .....	1
DWR Management Remarks – Mark Cowin, DWR.....	5
Results of the Public Comment Period – Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR .....	6
Informational Video on Water Plan – DWR.....	9
CALFED Urban Water Use Efficiency – David Mitchell, CALFED Consultant .....	10
Next Steps to Improve Quantitative Information – Rich Juricich, DWR .....	12
Lessons Learned from the Public Workshops – Gina Bartlett, Center for Collaborative Policy..	13
Public Comment.....	15
Final Comment.....	15
Administrative Items .....	15
Next Steps and Action Items .....	16

---

## SYNOPSIS

The California Water Plan Public Advisory Committee (AC) met on August 17, 2005. Two special caucus presentations on scenarios and potential response packages took place before the official meeting began. Afterward, Center for Collaborative Policy facilitator Lisa Beutler formally called the AC meeting to order, and DWR’s Kamyar Guivetchi welcomed AC members. Mark Cowin, DWR, expressed appreciation for AC members’ commitment in developing the Water Plan and provided an update on Proposition 50 funding applications. Feedback on the public process and Water Plan content was largely positive. Mark interpreted this response as indicating that DWR has a fair and balanced framework in the Water Plan. The Advisory Committee heard reports on public workshops and comments received on the draft Water Plan, discussed topics to be considered for developing the next Water Plan, and received updates on the CALFED Water Use Efficiency Comprehensive Review and next steps to improve Water Plan quantitative information.

## SPECIAL CAUCUS PRESENTATIONS

### **High Efficiency Water Use Scenario / Response Package Presented by Peter Gleick, Pacific Institute (PI)**

Peter Gleick, Heather Cooley, and David Groves developed a high efficiency scenario to look at water use in 2030 using the California Water Plan Update 2005’s “Current Trends” scenario presented as the basis while advancing urban use efficiency. Peter reminded the AC that scenarios examine different pictures of the future. Scenarios are not *predictions*, but rather represent achievable *possibilities*.

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

The Pacific Institute High Efficiency scenario maximizes Californians' ability to do what they want while minimizing the amount of water required to satisfy those desires. Under this scenario, water use in 2030 went down 20% compared to water use in 2000. The Pacific Institute believes that this scenario can be achieved with appropriate water policies. [Note: the Pacific Institute High Efficiency scenario includes water use efficiency (WUE) actions that are considered "response packages in the California Water Plan Update 2005].

The State of California has used scenarios in previous Water Plans back to 1966. Scenarios in past Water Plans have consistently projected increased total water demand in the future and exceeded actual use in the years for which the plans projected. The 2005 Water Plan Update has three scenarios: 1) Current Trends. 2) Less Resource Intensive and (2) More Resource Intensive. All three scenarios, intended as baselines, include efficiency improvements achievable with current policies and programs. DWR plans to evaluate various "response packages", including improved water use efficiency efforts for the next California Water Plan.

The Pacific Institute High Efficiency Scenario:

- Used the same Analytica model that was developed for the Water Plan
- Adopted the same demographic assumptions (i.e., population, housing distribution, agricultural land area, crop type and distribution, income projections) used in the Water Plan's Current Trends scenario.
- Assumed higher prices: Year 2000 plus 41% (rather than Water Plan's Current Trends year 2000 plus 20%)
- Increased (slightly higher) price elasticity
- Used the urban efficiency potential from the Pacific Institute's *Waste Not, Want Not*

Compared to the Water Plan's Current Trends scenario, the Pacific Institute's High Efficiency scenario assumes no new technologies are developed, the same demographic trends, continued strong agricultural production of food and fiber, more effective price controls, and significant implementation of additional WUE measures.

According to the Pacific Institute's scenario, urban water use decreases between 2000 and 2030 (0.5 million acre-feet (maf) in savings). Per-capita urban use is reduced. Demographics are a primary driver. Income elasticity is positive, which leads to increased water use because people have more money to buy water and things that require water. The scenario assumes implementation of non-price-driven efficiency or best management practices (BMPs) and standards. The scenario assumes aggressive efficiency improvements, plus additional price-driven efficiency.

Pacific Institute Agricultural Water Assumptions:

- Same land use assumptions as Water Plan Current Trends
- Same crop types, same crop yields, same elasticity
- Higher prices: Year 2000 plus 68%, which is historical trend plus full Central Valley Project repayment, (Current Trends: 2000 plus 10%)
- Almost all vineyards and orchards are on drip irrigation
- Vegetables mostly off flood and equally on sprinklers and drip

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

- Assume that yield is constant and water savings are put back into efficiency
- Applied water is less

The Pacific Institute high efficiency scenario assumes no new technology (i.e., no dual flush toilets or new irrigation). Also, the study did not discuss groundwater overdraft or conjunctive use, reclaimed/recycled water, or climate change.

The study concludes that increase in water demand is not inevitable. A high efficiency future can be projected by implementing new WUE measures with no new technologies. The Pacific Institute study reduces total 2030 California water use by 20% compared to 2000 use levels while maintaining the economic health of the urban and agricultural sectors. However, to reach this level would require serious effort on the part of policy makers, farmers, water managers, corporations, and the public. Pacific Institute advocates that actions toward greater efficiency must be implemented sooner rather than later.

### Question and Answer Period

Question: Can you describe the assumptions related to price? I am working on landscape efficiency and rate structures. Water districts hesitate to change rate structures based on directives from the State.

Response: Water conservation is driven by national laws and prices. Elasticity is an indication of how sensitive people are to price. Economists believe that people consume less as price increases. Demand management can be affected by price.

Question: Looking at applied water rather than consumptive use is misleading. Participant expressed concern that the increased price of food, which would result in increased population, is not addressed.

Response: The study does not look at international agricultural food markets. Water conservation improvements in agriculture might keep that water in agriculture. These points should be addressed over time.

Clarification: The Pacific Institute chose to adopt the Water Plan's Current Trends assumptions as "ground rules" so it could look at the efficiency assumptions specifically.

Question to DWR: This type of scenario is the kind of information that the Water Plan should make available to raise debate in the public. How would DWR respond to having this type of scenario or response in this Water Plan?

Response: DWR does not think it is possible to include this because it would be the only quantified response package in Water Plan 2005, and other water interests want to examine other response packages. The high efficiency scenario can be posted on the web site as an example for people to use now—before the next Water Plan is ready.

Comment: Member respectfully disagreed and recommended this be noted in some way within the Water Plan.

Question: How is income distributed with the rising income?

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

Response: This model does not disaggregate income by populations. The study does not address change in distribution of income and effect on choices.

Question: How is drought addressed?

Response: Droughts affect the permanency of efficiencies. Under drought, people pump more groundwater and let lawns go dry. The implications of droughts on this scenario need further study.

Comment: Participant does not agree that this is a *response package* and favors including it in the 2005 Water Plan. A response package would have adopted more *Waste Not, Want Not* [Pacific Institute report] strategies.

Question: What is a response package?

DWR Response: Response package are new actions beyond what agencies are doing now.

### **South Coast Scenario / Response Package**

**Presented by Robert Wilkinson, UC Santa Barbara and David Groves, Pardee RAND Graduate School**

Advisory Committee member Robert Wilkinson presented plans for a study on the South Coast that is underway. This study will be a scenario and a response package. The South Coast scenario/response package is using similar assumptions to the Water Plan's Current Trends scenario. Robert acknowledged financial and informational resources supporting the study.

The project will look at the top three water supply sources in the South Coast region: urban water use efficiency, conjunctive management, and recycled municipal water. The study will build on the best studies and research on each of the three supplies. The study will use a model to generate scenarios and facilitate dialogue. The Analytica model is the same one used for the Water Plan that was developed by David Groves.

#### *Key Variables*

The study will work with variables: holding some constant and varying others; exploring "what if" scenarios; changing related assumptions; and examining the implications. The variables are:

- Technology implementation
- Population and location of water use
- Prices and rate structures
- Groundwater management
- Climate change

The study will explore robust strategies by considering what combination or "portfolio" of water management strategies might build resilient systems under differing scenarios. Using the model, stakeholders will explore various combinations of management options. The scenario generator will support discussion of merits and risks of various portfolios of strategies. (RAND is conducting

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

concurrently a linked robust decision-making study.) Finally, the study will examine policy and investment opportunities for public and private resources.

An Advisory Board for the study has been assembled. Robert Wilkinson invited Advisory Committee members to provide guidance and make the studies available.

### **Question and Answer Period**

Question: Will adjudicated basins in Southern California affect the study?

Response: Generally, adjudicated basins are easier to understand because people are already working together and studying those basins.

Question: Regarding groundwater storage, yield depends on whether storage can be filled with water that would otherwise be lost to use. Climate change implies that California will lose millions of acre-feet in snow-pack storage, affecting water supply. How will you assess that?

Response: We will limit that somewhat because of the geographic location. The region imports about 25% of the water it uses from the state system. One outcome of the study will look at recharge potential. Efficiency potential throughout the region will be used. The goal is to build resilience.

Question: Are you looking for changes in the landscape vegetative cover and land management and local water supply coming off the watershed?

Response: No, we can look at additional input if provided.

Question: Are you looking at land use development patterns and the contribution those might make? Will you look at soil chemistry?

Response: The study will not be at that level of detail in this analysis, but it could be considered in the future.

Response by David Groves: Model handles coarse land use changes, such as population density and distribution. Follow-on study could go into more detail.

### **ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

#### **DWR Management Remarks – Mark Cowin, DWR**

Mark Cowin, Chief of the DWR Division of Planning and Local Assistance, expressed gratitude to the Advisory Committee members who hosted, attended and spoke at the public input workshops in June and July. Feedback on the public process and Water Plan content was largely positive. Mark interpreted this response as indicating that DWR has a fair and balanced framework in the Water Plan.

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

### *Overwhelming Response to Proposition 50 Grant Applications*

Proposition 50 grant applications were due in mid-July. DWR received an overwhelming response: 50 applications requesting \$1.4 billion (DWR only has \$150 million to distribute) for total project costs of over \$4 billion. An additional round of funding will be available in a few years. Mark displayed a map demonstrating that regional planning efforts, represented by the applicants, covered most of the state. DWR will make the grant awards next summer.

### *Upcoming Workshop for New Advisory Committee*

Mark urged AC members to attend the workshop on September 14 to provide input on how to form the next AC. DWR has benefited greatly from the work of the AC and would like to continue improving these efforts.

### **Results of the Public Comment Period – Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR**

Kamyar Guivetchi, Program Manager for the Water Plan, summarized the outcome of the public comment period as well as DWR's progress in responding to comments.

#### *7 Ways to Comment*

DWR provided the public "7 Ways to Comment": workshops, phone-in sessions, online comment form, email, snail mail, phone, and fax. DWR held 13 public workshops in June. A total of 244 people attended. Typically, about 20 people attended although the high was 44 in Los Angeles and the low was 6 in Eureka and Chino. Kamyar emphasized that those sessions were "workshops" not "hearings". The workshop format encouraged interactive education and discussion in the early part, and formal statements later in the workshop. Advisory Committee member presentations were integral to the success of the workshops and mentioned in many of the comments. AC members spoke about the role of the AC in developing the Water Plan, summarized the views of the AC, and urged attendees to comment on the Water Plan. The *Advisory Committee View* handout presented areas of agreement, disagreement, and uncertainty in a newsletter-like format. Each caucus had a representative who worked with the Center for Collaborative Policy to develop the *Advisory Committee View*, and CCP circulated the document several times before distributing it to the public at the workshops. The *Advisory Committee View* narrative will become an article in the Reference Guide (Volume 4) as a document by the AC and not by DWR staff.

Four hundred questions and comments received in public comment workshops resulted in about 100 unique comments. In addition, DWR received 138 letters and emails from 98 organizations and 40 individuals. All the comments are available on the [Water Plan website](#), including the author and subject. DWR staff have developed an internal comment log that tracks individual comment (some letters have more than one comment), including the appropriate Water Plan volume editor and the subject matter expert responsible for responding.

### *Summary of Comments*



## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

Comments are categorized into the following categories or types: policy, technical, graphical/presentation, “liked”, and other. A table summarizes the types of comments received and assigned to the appropriate volume. Of the 615 unique comments, 45% were technical and 33% focused on policy. Fifty-eight percent of comments focused on Volume 1 Highlights, and 25% were on Volume 2 Management Strategies.

### *Outline of DWR Responses*

To manage the comments effectively and ensure the appropriate response, DWR has categorized responses to the comments. All comments fall into one of the following categories:

- 26% (157 comments) = *Type 1*: Comment is already addressed in the Water Plan.
- 40% (247 comments) = *Type 2*: Comment is within the purview of the Water Plan purview, and DWR revising for clarification or content
- 9% (55 comments) = *Type 2A*: Within Water Plan purview, but no change to be made.
- 20% (122 comments) = *Type 3*: Comment is within purview of Water, but has to be considered during next Update
- 4% (24 comments) = *Type 4*: Comment not within purview of the Water Plan (no change).
- 2% (10 comments) = DWR staff is still considering how to respond.

Work on the responses is underway. Kamyar presented a summary of the policy comments received (broken down by DWR response type listed immediately above) to give AC members a sense of the breadth of comments received and how DWR is responding. Kamyar elaborated on how DWR subject matter experts are trying to take a fair and balanced approach to all comments received. Some comments have already been addressed in the Water Plan and specifically discussed and negotiated with the AC. Based on the review to date, DWR did not receive comment topics that have not been discussed by the Advisory Committee or covered in the *Advisory Committee View* document. This demonstrates to DWR that the AC has been effective in raising the most important issues.

*Topics for Next Water Plan (“Parking Lot” or Response Type 3)* are comments that DWR does not have time to deal with now but DWR is committed to work on for the next Water Plan Update. The “parking lot” is broken down into policy and technical issues. None of the policy issues surprised DWR or the AC. A few of the technical topics relate to improving data. Other topics focus on scenario and response package activities and the interrelationships of resource management strategies.

### *Production Schedule*

Public Review Draft	April 2005
Public Workshops Completed	June/July
Content Changes	Mid-September
Document Layout/Design	October
Get Approval to Print	Nov-Dec
Final Water Plan	Dec 2005

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

### **Discussion and Feedback**

Facilitator Lisa Beutler invited AC members to add on to existing comments provided by the public and discuss topics for the next Water Plan update.

Comment: The California Water Balance stacked bar chart is disturbing for many people. Labeling and other aspects should be re-considered.

Question: Any sense about groupings of attendees?

Response: Statewide, a diversity of people attended the workshops although people might have been concentrated regionally. Generally, DWR did not receive a lot of different comments across meeting locations.

Comment: AC member expressed concern about the amount of work involved to review the whole document in response to changes made from public comments and requested that a summary on fundamental changes be provided.

Response: DWR will share the “track/change” version for Response Type 2 (DWR revising Water Plan). This will be available in September.

### *AC Discussion on Topics for Next Water Plan Update*

Question: Why is water quality in this category?

Response: In this case, comment specified that the Water Plan provide additional work on water quality.

Question: On “technical topics” and “incorporate data from water management plans,” concerned about the timing of the plans. For example, Urban Water Management Plan data will be 5 years old in 2010 for the next water plan. Can you speak to the phasing of the Water Plans? Dennis O’Connor recently suggested that legislation requires another Water Plan in 2008.

Response: Years ending in 3 and 8 were set in the Water Code to correspond with Urban Water Management Plan updates. DWR can produce a plan in 2008, but it limits what can be done before then. DWR is willing to present what can be accomplished in 2008 and 2010. The planning process is now an ongoing process so compiling a plan in 2008 is easier; however, to do all the desired analyses would require more time.

Question: We discussed that the data and quantitative process would be included in the next Water Plan.

Response: Items # 11-21 in the “parking lot” handout deal with the quantitative data and analytical tools.

Comment: Recommend taking the Pacific Institute High Efficiency Scenario out of the “parking lot” and putting it into the current Water Plan.

Response: DWR suggested that it might be willing to cite the scenario as a response package in Volume 1, Chapter 4 (“Preparing for an Uncertain Future”) and/or in the Reference Guide (Volume 4).

Comment: Support expressed to include the entire Pacific Institute High Efficiency Scenario, but willing to accept part of it.



## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

Comment: Concern that the bar graph for the potential water supply benefits of resource management strategies has not been revised.

Response: The general format of that graph is not going to change. Subject matter experts spent a year analyzing this issue. Those are documented from other reports. If data are wrong or new studies emerge, change in the chart would be considered before going to print.

Comment: Critique expressed by various parties. Given the aspiration to be “balanced,” urge that all perspectives be presented.

Comment: The social and political ramifications to communities should be considered in the next Water Plan. For example, the Water Plan should look at legislative actions, data, and decision-making affected by the Water Plan.

Comment: Add “public interest” into this list. The privatization of water, for example, should be considered as part of the Water Plan. Expressed support for including the Pacific Institute High Efficiency Scenario to demonstrate a possibility of water use being reduced by 2030.

Comment: Appropriated water and water rights should also be added to the parking lot.

Comment: Suggest that DWR elaborate on the topics in the “parking lot” to ensure clarity that comments are covered.

Comment: Projects are evaluated and funded in the context of regional planning. An adaptive management strategy could examine the role of regional planning and DWR’s function in that role. The next Water Plan should describe the role of adaptive management in regional planning to demonstrate that public funds are generating benefits.

Comment: Comments that have arrived after the comment period or analyses that have not been reviewed by the AC or exhaustively by DWR staff should not be included. Work like the Pacific Institute High Efficiency Scenario and the ACWA Blueprint are important, but should not be included in Water Plan 2005.

### *Closing*

The AC will have a workshop to provide input on forming the next AC, addressing regions, operating within the law, etc. There might also be some benefit of having a workshop on *next steps* to grapple with issues related to corresponding studies and other areas that might benefit from AC member insight before the Water Plan 2005 Advisory Committee process officially ends.

### **Informational Video on Water Plan – DWR**

DWR has developed an 8-minute video to provide an overview of the Water Plan’s Framework for Action and other key components. The AC viewed the film, which is not yet available for public release. DWR will make the film available on DVD and include it with hardcopies of the final *Water Plan Highlights* document.

Comment: Avoid using danger symbols and cross-bones when referring to reclaimed water.

Comment: The film is very well done; however, the film overstates the Water Plan's ability to assure water availability in 2030.

## **CALFED Urban Water Use Efficiency – David Mitchell, CALFED Consultant**

David Mitchell gave a presentation on the CALFED Water Use Efficiency (WUE) Comprehensive Review's Urban Conservation Projections. He specifically focused on the study's objective, projection levels, methods and data, and results.

The Comprehensive Review (Review) was required by the CALFED Record of Decision (ROD) to determine its effectiveness regarding efficiency. The Review looks at what has been accomplished and looks forward to define efficiency potential through 2030. The objective of the urban analysis is to bracket an expected range of urban water savings given existing and expected code requirements, existing Best Management Practices (BMPs), Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), other proven conservation measures, and alternative levels of state and federal investment consistent with the ROD. The study does not estimate the maximum savings potential nor does it see the "socially optimal" level of urban conservation.

The analysis will be used to guide the water use efficiency program implementation, the focus and level of investment, for surface storage investigations (Common Assumptions), and results may be reflected in future Water Plan Updates. The scope of analysis presented at the meeting was statewide for the 2000-2030 timeframe. Evaluated measures are described in a separate handout called "Table 5-1: Measures Used to project Urban Water Conservation Potential." The model uses a decision-making tree to determine what actions are included.

The model generates regional cost-effective savings potential and shortfalls. In other words, how much subsidy CALFED needs to provide to make it worthwhile for the regions to implement efficiency measures. The model also helps to prioritize funding allocations.

The Review makes six efficiency projections. The projections examine savings generated from regulatory codes, local implementation, and financial assistance. The Review presents a range of savings potential. The "higher" number, or baseline, is DWR's applied water use estimate, which embeds efficiency measures being implemented (current state in 2000 only expanding by population). The "lower" number in the range assumes 100% adoption of all conservation measures considered in the study – the "Technical Potential" (approximately 2.5 maf more in efficiency savings).

The Review demonstrates that local areas lack funding to fully realize potential water savings. Projections that add federal and state funding generate additional savings potential. Per capita water use is reduced under all six projections in the study compared to the 2000 urban use, and the projections that couple additional federal and state funding yield the greatest savings.

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

The model estimates what is reasonably cost effective for local agencies to implement. However, it is important to realize that the modeling is based on certain assumptions. The “user” has to agree with the assumptions or understand them to accept the validity of the results.

**Investment Costs:** The projections that provide water savings requires \$100 - \$250 million to save 2 – 2.5 maf, with the bulk provided by local, direct funding. The unit cost of the status quo is \$522/acre-foot of savings. The other projections are \$223-\$395 per acre-foot. The highest is for conservation at the tap, i.e. water that has already been delivered. The most effective cost projections are between \$223-233 per acre-foot (for three of the projections).

A draft of the report should be available in early September followed by a public review and comment period.

### **Question and Answer Period**

Question: Is this applied water or consumptive water?

Answer: This is applied water savings.

Comment: Most savings come from urban areas, not the Central Valley. Implementation is not keeping track with local cost effectiveness, i.e. without some influx of funds, the state will not be able to realize this level of savings.

Question: What do we need to do collectively to move forward? Does this model facilitate in any way a group like the Water Plan AC that explores the “what ifs”? How can we use it in the future?

Answer: This model has some capability to do “what ifs”. One can change assumptions related to energy costs, savings assumptions, benefits to users, mandatory actions, etc. Pushing beyond the projection horizon is difficult.

Question: Can this be presented on a regional basis?

Answer: The report will present vast regions and is unable to present sub-regions.

Question: The original ROD had some milestones for efficiency. Were they reached?

Answer: The ROD identified potential for Stage 1. The Review identifies that the state did not reach that potential. The ROD was not fully funded, and local funding was inadequate.

Question: You mentioned the value of water to the state. Did you estimate that?

Answer: In Southern California and Bay Area, estimates were provided by CALFED. In other areas, values were based on the environmental water account. The model pushes the investment dollars to the part of the state where it will have the most benefit considering the value of the water to the region and the cost of the action in the region.

## **Next Steps to Improve Quantitative Information – Rich Juricich, DWR**

Rich Juricich provided an overview of an Analytical Tools and Data Work Team workshop held June 3 on quantitative information activities. His remarks focused on promoting collaboration, facilitating information exchange, and developing numbers for the Water Plan Update.

DWR is partnering on near-term studies with David Groves of the RAND Corporation and others to evaluate uncertainty in water management using scenarios, Bob Wilkinson at UC Santa Barbara on a South Coast Scenario, and the Natural Heritage Institute, the National Center for Atmospheric Research, and the Tellus Institute to evaluate the effects of climate change.

DWR is meeting with state and regional planning agencies and exploring websites that provide information exchange. DWR is also looking at other large-scale data management efforts (land and water use database/web portal, state water bond portfolios, and others).

A major area of activity focuses on improving the numbers or quantitative information. DWR is working on three sets of deliverables: Water Portfolios, Future Scenarios, and Alternative Response Packages. DWR proposes to focus on one reporting metric at a time (e.g. urban water supply reliability). DWR is interacting with experts to create and refine the conceptual design. To develop the numbers, DWR will select potential implementation techniques and test them throughout the process. The Unified Process is one approach that has been used successfully in the software industry.

DWR will work through a new Institutional Framework to develop an information exchange strategy, developing a glossary of terms, water budget components, and data guidelines. DWR will start by linking and/or publishing data used by the Water Plan and CALFED Bay-Delta Program on urban water use efficiency, agricultural water use efficiency, conjunctive management, water recycling, desalination, and water transfers.

DWR will continue to seek advice from the Analytical Tools and Data Work Group on how best to proceed. The key element is implementing the Institutional Framework.

Question: Who makes the decision on better data of groundwater? Current Water Plan uses groundwater data from the 1970s, which is out-of-date. Where can we get better numbers?

Response: Staff agrees that good data on groundwater is lacking. The first step is to capture the need in the conceptual design. Bulletin 118 is a possible source, but policy decisions to get “better” data are also needed.

Question: Whose decision is that? The Director’s or Legislature’s?

Response: Most likely both Director Snow and the legislature.

Comment: This effort represents progress from previous efforts. I would support that the Advisory Committee articulate the need for better data to the legislature in some manner.

Response: DWR has been having a lively internal discussion to fill data gaps. DWR has an annual process to inform management of resource needs. Because data is linked to the General Fund,

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

resources are out of the Water Plan's control. DWR has to figure out how to establish sustainable funding.

Comment: I think there would unanimous consent by the AC to validate the need for this. I would suggest we make that kind of statement, if that is any help, to say that formally as one of the AC's closing acts.

Facilitator: The AC cannot entertain motions, unless in writing. The AC probably needs one more workshop for content / recommendations that could come to our last formal meeting for you to adopt. Circulating this proposal should become an action item.

Comment: Funding was identified four years ago. There seems to be two big pieces: institutional coordination of data and development of modeling tools. I was disappointed to see no recommended funding from the CALFED Science Program, but I don't think the Water Plan should have to compete with core funding for the state. When presenting the final plan to the legislature, the AC should lobby aggressively for the needed funds at every opportunity. The Water Plan should not have to compete in the CALFED Science Program.

### **Lessons Learned from the Public Workshops – Gina Bartlett, Center for Collaborative Policy**

Gina Bartlett from the Center for Collaborative Policy provided a brief overview on lessons learned from the public workshops and phone-in sessions in June and July. Gina touched on feedback on format, AC member participation, recommendations for next time, and comparison to previous Water Plan public meetings.

The public process was generally well received. Most participants appreciated the format, contributed and "had their say" within the workshop. Some with formal oral comments wanted to present first in the workshop rather than at the end although few people actually spoke at the end. Most participants came without having read the Plan. Those without prior knowledge liked the table breakout session, learning from others and sharing their ideas. DWR technical staff members attended meetings and were able to answer questions of clarification. This was appreciated by participants.

The role of the AC members was critical. AC members spoke at the meetings, providing credibility, sharing insights, and raising the level of interest among participants. The *Advisory Committee View* provided common talking points across meetings and also helped document areas of agreement and disagreement across the AC.

Approximately 250 people attended the workshops and phone-in sessions combined. However, only 6 people used the phone-in sessions. This turnout could be indicative of the relatively little controversy in the Water Plan (i.e. high comfort level, low fury factor) rather than boycott or apathy. It does, however, support recommendations for outreach.

Broader outreach is needed. Except for agriculture, the private and for-profit sector (e.g. businesses, developers and landscapers, etc.) were not well represented in the meetings. Stakeholders had not heard about nor seen the Water Plan in the mass media (newspaper, radio, public TV, etc.). Phone-

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

in sessions were not well attended. Telephone attendees found out about sessions through personal contacts. “Piggy-backing” on other standing stakeholder forums helped attendance. Los Angeles, scheduled in place of the regular Southern CA Water Dialogue meeting, had the best attendance. Defining the schedule earlier in advance would allow for notices to be placed in topical publications and newsletters and to plan workshops around existing meetings. Relying on free meeting space was great for the budget, but constrained flexibility. Some locations were inconvenient.

Ariel Ambruster, a graduate student at UC Berkeley, is doing a comparative study of this plan to the previous Water Plan Update, called Bulletin 160-98. The public meeting format was different in 1998; 104 people attended 9 public hearings. In 1993, 250 people attended 21 public hearings.

Comment: Bulletin 160-98 public hearings were poorly received, and DWR had appeared defensive. DWR has corrected those problems.

Comment: People came with expectations for a traditional hearing and were disappointed. Next time, announce the meeting format more clearly, so participants have clear expectations.

Response: Hearings were held at end of the workshops. DWR can try to make this more explicit.

Comment: How did the word get out?

Response: Outreach was basic. Outreach included notices, DWR news clips, and reliance upon AC member networks. Timing was an issue and shifting dates prevented many announcements in newsletters and similar publications.

Comment: No editorials were published.

Response: Controversy would have increased attendance.

Comment: Although Los Angeles turnout was good, AC member expressed surprise that the attendance was not larger. Marketing is critical.

Response: Attendance confirmed that evening meetings were not needed. Although promising and hopeful that they’ll work next time, the phone-in sessions didn’t work well. DWR needs to continue to explore different channels to raise publicity and encourage participation.

Comment: A forum to reach local governments and communities must exist that DWR could tap. DWR might also have to consider hiring a public relations firm.

Response: The next Water Plan will have a regional focus, which by design will have that local focus.

Comment: Outreach requires significant resources, and state resources need to be provided to support outreach. The whole notion of environmental justice (EJ) in CALFED or any state program is slightly flawed. The EJ community cares, but in terms of relevance, a lot of people are working really hard just to make their lives work. Everyone is usually expected to participate in Sacramento without compensation. When people don’t come, agencies tend to say, “You had your chance to participate.” This attitude can create antagonism.



## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

Comment: To improve attendance on the telephone, consider recruiting someone from legislature or city council or supervisor to participate to raise the forum's profile.

Comment: Maybe the people who are interested in Water Plan are attending--same with telephone call-in. Allowing people to call in by phone is a good service.

Comment: Mark Cowin came down to brief my city council at our request. That was great outreach to our local community.

Response: DWR has done massive outreach at that level, including dozens of briefings. This parallels, but is separate from the public workshop critique. The overall briefing process has been robust and opportunities for outreach continue.

Comment: Personally want to thank Kamyar for what he has done.

### **Public Comment**

Jeffrey Volberg, Southern California Water Company: Mr. Volberg stated that his organization had already submitted written comments on the Water Plan, but he wanted to reiterate a few points: 1) Regulated water utilities should be included among public water suppliers. 2) Regulated water utilities and their ratepayers should have access to state bond funds. 3) The Southern California Water Company strongly supports integrated regional water management. He thanked DWR for its good work, and said that the Framework for Action is useful.

Announcement: Effective October 1, Southern California Water Company will cease to exist by that name. It will be called Golden State Water Company.

### **Final Comment**

Comments: Thinking over the day, AC member would like to see a reference to the Pacific Institute High Efficiency Scenario.

### **Administrative Items**

Associates from the DWR Management Development Program are conducting a study of the process of developing the California Water Plan. The group asked Advisory Committee members to complete a survey to support their analysis.

## Advisory Committee Meeting

August 17, 2005

9:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

Sterling Hotel, Sacramento, CA

---

### **Next Steps and Action Items**

- Hold a workshop on the process for the next Advisory Committee and Water Plan.
- Hold a workshop on the parking lot—items to be discussed in the next Water Plan.
- Hold a workshop on additional recommendations from the existing AC, related to data and other initiatives. Including, AC recommendation to fund and support data gathering and management activities.